

# The Converted Catholic.

## A Monthly Publication

Specially designed for the Enlightenment and Conversion  
of Roman Catholics.

Edited and Published by Father O'Connor at 60 Bible House, New York.

MAY, 1885.

Vol. II. No. 6.

Subscription \$1.00 per annum.

### CONTENTS

Editorial Notes.....	161	The Moral Theology of the Jesuits. Official Approval. Preface. Treatise on Human Acts. The Principles of Acts. Cases of Conscience on Human Acts.....	174
Converts from Rome. Letters from James Mulloy and J. H. Keeley.....	163	Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal McCloskey (second series). Letter V.....	180
Father Gavazzi in Rome.....	165	Rome: Pagan and Papal (con- tinued). Chapter x.....	188
Jesus and Peter....	166		
The Church of Rome evidently proved Heretick. By Dr. Peter Berault, A.D. 1670....	169		
A Significant Letter.....	173		

### EDITORIAL NOTES.

WE WILL SEND THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC to all new subscribers from now until the end of the year for 50 cents. Here is a way that our friends can very materially help us. Let each get one new subscriber and we shall be able to extend our work and greatly increase the usefulness of our Monthly.

NOTICES OF REFORMED CATHOLIC work during the past month are held over until our next issue. Sunday, May 3d, Rev. Wm. D. Fox preached in Newark, and Pastor Stephen Dekins opened a new mission in 125th Street and Lexington Avenue. We hope the Christian people of Harlem will wel-

come and sustain him in his self-sacrificing labors.

AT THE REFORMED CATHOLIC SERVICES in Masonic Temple, Sunday, May 3d, the Rev. Mason Gallagher, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, delivered an eloquent address in response to the circular of the Evangelical Alliance, on the aggressions of Jesuitical Romanism upon civil and religious liberty and its efforts to destroy our unsectarian institutions. It was a most learned discourse. The speaker's sympathy for the Roman Catholic people who are defrauded and deceived by their Church was marked throughout. The Rev. Frank E. Kavanagh, pastor of the Presby-

terian Church, Wappingers Falls, N. Y., was present during the latter part of the service and Father O'Connor introduced him to the congregation. He made a touching address on his own conversion from Romanism, and his past work in the Reformed Catholic movement.

"THE MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE Jesuits" will repay a careful perusal. We shall endeavor to keep the translation free from the charge of "dryness" usually brought against theological articles, while strictly adhering to the Latin text.

WE DO NOT SEEK TO MAGNIFY THE difficulties of the Reformed Catholic work and the publication of a Monthly like this, but will only say that they can be more easily overcome by the generous sympathy of all good Christians. Humanly speaking ours is not a pleasant work; for until Roman Catholics are converted they load us with vituperation; and indifferent Protestants who neither pray nor read God's Word care nothing for us. But as from the beginning our aim has been the salvation of souls from the false doctrines and superstitions that we know by sad experience are making the truth of God of no effect, and are hindrances to communion with Christ, the Saviour, we have been sustained by the consciousness that we were doing a work that would bear abundant fruit. It has borne fruit, thank God, and many are now "rejoicing in God their Saviour" as the Virgin Mary did, who learned the way of salvation from the converted Catholic preachers and writers. The difficulties are great, but they can be overcome by the grace of God and zeal tempered with dis-

cretion. We ask the prayers of all our readers for the workers in this cause.

NOW THAT THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE has succeeded in defeating the political machinations of the Jesuits, will it not turn its attention to the souls of the people that are in danger of being lost through that false system of religion of which the Jesuits are the embodiment? Political institutions may rise and fall, but the souls of men that Jesus Christ came into the world to save will live forever. Is the Roman Church a sure and safe means of reconciling the sinful soul with God and thus accomplishing the work of Christ? Every member of the Alliance will answer, "It is not." Then, brethren, do something for those souls that are deceived by that Church. Establish missions for their enlightenment and conversion and they will be on the Lord's side and your side in every future contest with the powers of darkness. The Roman Catholics can be converted now as well as in the time of the Reformation if earnest work be done in this direction. Martin Luther had the good fortune to be able to influence some of the powerful and wealthy men of his time, and by their aid, with Christ leading and the Holy Spirit directing, the movement became a glorious success. There are 7,000,000 Roman Catholics in the United States to-day bowing down before the same idols that Luther overthrew, and no human hand of power or wealth is stretched out to help those who are doing their best to deliver them. The conversion of the people is the only solution of the Roman Catholic question that will permanently neutralize the attempts of that Church against the religious and civil freedom of the country. A converted Catholic never returns to that Church, but is a light unto many to follow his example. That such a work deserves encouragement, is agreed to by all. Then, brethren, do something towards their conversion.

**CONVERTS FROM ROME.**

It is sometimes said that the Irish Roman Catholic working men and working girls cannot be converted. The great majority of those converted at the Reformed Catholic meetings in New York, Newark, and Brooklyn belong to the hard-working class. Only let the effort be made to reach them and it will be found that they are not outside the pale of the Gospel. The good Deacon who was afraid of the wrath of the Roman Catholics of Springfield if he gave employment to a converted Catholic may be peculiar to Massachusetts, and we trust he is, but doubtless he would claim in his defence that the Roman Catholics are so powerful in that State, with the Mayor of Boston at their head, that it is a risky thing for any business man to perform an act of kindness that may displease them.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,

April 7th, 1885.

FATHER O'CONNOR:

DEAR SIR:—I borrowed your magazine from the Y. M. C. A. In it I find you want to know the name and address of all those who left the Church of Rome. I am one of them. I was nineteen years in Ireland and have lived ten years in this city. I have been seven years a member of the North Congregational Church. My business is that of a hod-carrier, but last August I was porter in one of the largest grocery stores in this city. My wife had an "Agnus Dei" which she

opened, and I found within it a piece of dirty old newspaper. Four weeks ago last Sunday I exhibited it at the Salvation Army meeting, and the Roman Catholics mobbed me. Two weeks from that time I was discharged from my employment. The Monday following I obtained work where the boss, who is a Deacon (not of my church), understood why I had been discharged, but he would not set me at work. I have had proof that all my Roman Catholic neighbors have been to my landlord asking him to turn me out, but he has refused to do so. If I had money enough to pay my fare to New York, I should like to have a talk with you, as I do not intend to keep still about this matter. Will you send me any books that you think I may profit by reading. I have not any money to pay for them now. If you send me any books or papers you must trust me or the Lord to pay for them.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES MULLOY.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SAILOR WHO  
FOUND JESUS.

A few months ago I was in the city of New Orleans on the Lord's day, and, as my custom is, sought a place that I might worship and keep the day holy in obedience to the commandment. Being a stranger in a strange city, I sought out that family of the God's people known as Methodists, and attended morning services at Ames M. E. Church. The sermon gave food for the soul and inspiration for a better life. The minister announced that at the close of services "class-meeting" would be held in the lecture-room; and thither, after the benediction,

assembled one-third of the congregation. What is a class-meeting? Well, it is a place where Christians recite to each other the lessons the Lord has been teaching them along the pilgrimage of life. And as is true in purely human affairs, you can hear all kinds of experiences at these meetings. Some have learned precious, gracious lessons, and can tell them triumphantly with glowing fervor; others find the lessons hard to learn and give testimony of great trials and difficulties in trying to understand them. But to this meeting. There we were, a hundred or more, from many States and many foreign nations. Dr. —, from New Jersey, led the meeting. Bro. A—, from New York, made us feel glad he was with us. A merchant from Illinois said religion was good up there, etc, etc. So our thoughts were led on, and the good Spirit of the great God moved all our hearts, and filled the room. One said he was a German, and an unbeliever once, but the Spirit reached his heart, and where then sagged along the turbid stream of doubt and gloom, there now went rushing on the sparkling stream of joy and hope, whose source was faith. Another said he knew "the way of the transgressor was hard," but even in that "way" he found the Master "seeking to save him who was lost." The last speaker scarcely closed his remarks, when, to the left, there rose up quickly a man of middle age, under whose sun-browned features shone a happy, peaceful face. He spoke in substance as follows: "Yes, 'seeking to save the lost,' he *does* seek, and he *does* save any and all who seek him. My German brother says he saved him. Yes, and he saved me too, an Irish-

man, and a Catholic at that. I learned the Catechism in my youth, and had a form of religion as I grew up. I'd go to the priest and confess my sins. I hated all other people but Catholics. I could curse them, but you may be sure I didn't pray much for them. I thought that the preachers who went praying about deserved nothing but hanging. I swore and drank, and when I became a sailor I went to the bad by the jump. I had many a spat on religion, but I've learned lately that what I thought I was fighting for I didn't have at all. I needed the Saviour in my heart, and this I didn't have, and when in my wickedness I went to the Bethel down along the river, two years ago, 'twas there first my heart was touched. Oh I am glad I went to the Bethel, where the Gospel is preached so plainly. For two years I have had the joy of this Saviour. He forgives my sin. He is all I want." Thus he spoke, and his beaming face and earnest words told us all how much his heart was in what he said, and how well he knew the meaning of the bondage of the "letter" and the freedom of the "spirit." So we meet these converts from Rome everywhere. Those who have found Christ a personal Saviour, a present and continual joy, quickly see that there is no further need for Romish ceremonies. Success to all Christian workers, but especially those who lead men and women to a personal Jesus that will say, "Thy sins, which are many, are all forgiven." After the adjournment of the meeting, it was found that there were two present, besides the writer, who once were Roman Catholics.

J. H. KEELEY.

KNOX, PA., April 24th.

**Father Gavazzi in Rome.**

Father Gavazzi is now holding a series of public conferences in the Hall of the Free Italian Church, a building admirably adapted for such work, being situated amidst a dense population and also being, as it were, immediately under the very eye of the Pope. The Bridge of St. Angelo is the connecting link between it and the Vatican, so that all pilgrims and priests returning from the Pope's palace see first of all this great building, now devoted to the propaganda of pure Christianity, and filled week after week with enthusiastic audiences to hear the sarcastic and scathing invectives and the clear and convincing arguments of Signor Gavazzi.

His first conference was devoted to the theme, "The Impossibility of Conciliation between the Papacy and Italy," in which the main line of argument was as follows:

1st. The Pope has no right to be a king, for if he wishes to follow Christ he should make his kingdom not of this world, as Christ said, for the servant should be as the Master.

2d. Peter was a poor fisherman, having left all to follow Christ. He was a fisher of men and had nothing. Therefore the Pope, if he wishes to be considered the successor of Peter, should not make it his whole study to secure the kingly powers which he has ever striven to grasp and keep.

The second conference was also crowded and the audience completely carried away by the eloquent orator. The main scope of the lecture was an argument against transubstantiation, using it as a proof of the impossibility of conciliation between the Papacy,

which is ever the same, and true religion.

We give only one extract from the personal experience of Signor Gavazzi, as he related it, amid the hearty laughter and applause of the large audience.

He said: "I recollect fifty years ago I had to say the first mass on Christmas day in Rome, where the wine being good and the supply full, the priests, after celebrating three masses, returned to the sacristy in a very happy and hilarious manner. Tell me, was that the effect of real wine or was it not?"

"Hear another anecdote regarding the host. Forty-four years ago, with my colleagues of the Barnabite fraternity, I was holding a mission in a certain part of Southern Italy, and the mission being finished there was held a general communion. It was calculated that there would be about 5,000 communicants, and as it was not possible to hold the service in a church it was held in the open air in the country. But of the 5,000 hosts which had been prepared, 300 remained. What was to be done? They must be consumed, for they could not be left in the open country nor could they be carried back, for they had no 'ombrellino,' nor candles, nor anything needful. Therefore it fell to me, being the youngest, to consume them, which meant to eat them. I commenced to eat them ten by ten. The first fifty went well, but every succeeding handful found a terrible paste in my mouth, like to choke me, and it was only after great labor that I finished the whole. I was ill all day, and instead of joining the other priests at the closing dinner in the parish priest's house, I had to go to bed, the victim of a terrible indigestion. Now, I demand, were those 300 hosts true hosts or true bread?"

## JESUS AND PETER.

## A FRIEND INDEED.

"I shall always remain your friend so long as you act rightly, and respect yourself." Thus wrote a prominent politician and philanthropist of the last generation to a young man he was befriending. The sentiment is good, so far as it goes. But, alas! in this world of erring mortals that is not very far. Life had been a hopeless failure to most of us had we not known friendship of a type totally different to this.

"Father, if I become wicked, will you stop loving me?" "No, my boy, I shall go on loving you; but it will be with a grieved, hurt kind of love."

Contrast this with the foregoing, and then compare it with the sacred words: "Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them *unto the end*."

If you would learn *how* he loved unto the end, turn to the case of the apostle Peter, and, from each of the six distinct steps taken by our Lord for Peter's restoration, learn the wonderful tenacity, tenderness, and depth of the Saviour's friendship. Such a review can hardly fail to fire all your heart with love and praise, and woo it into a sweeter, closer confidence.

It is remarkable that each of these acts of restoration was Christ's, not Peter's. Is it not always so? Unless the Good Shepherd both seeks the strayed, and carries it home, there will be no return.

Further, two out of these six steps in the restoration of Peter were taken before ever the sin was committed, and may be called our Lord's prevenient acts of restoring grace. Here we see how heavenly love in its thoughtfulness

and wisdom looks along the future, foresees and estimates the coming sin and danger, and lays up help accordingly. Who is a friend like our Friend?

*1st Step.*—"I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not" (Luke xxii., 32).

The sin in all its vividness; also the need, misery, and danger that would come with it—all had been seen and prayed over. What reality does this give to the intercession of Christ, our High Priest! Wandering brother, take heart and return, since he has prayed for thee. And we, whose backslidings are healed, whose wanderings ended, let us afresh love and adore as we remember that all this is due to his personal pleadings for us.

"That thy faith fail not." The peculiar danger of a fallen believer lies less in the special sin that laid him low, however great that may be, than in the strong tendency to proud despair, which is sure to come in its train. "I have gone too far to return!" say many, who either go straightway into deeper sin, just because they have lost hope, or else, like miserable Judas, go out and destroy themselves. Is it not beautiful to see how the kind physician in his perfect understanding of the need made such special preparation for it? And, too, should not the sinful learn from this the awful danger of despair, and so rouse themselves to follow eagerly and at once the least ray of hope that enlightens their gloom?

*2nd Step.*—"I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me" (Luke xxii., 34).

Having laid up help for Peter in heaven, our Lord now proceeds to do



the same on earth. His plan is the more wonderful in that he chooses a common cock as his servant. He so arranges the talk at the supper-table that the cock-crowing, which Peter is to hear twice on the following morning—a sound which would otherwise have no significance—shall speak for Christ himself to his guilty conscience. By no chance work did those clear, clarion tones awake the sinner to his sin. It was all according to the pre-arrangement of the wise and watchful Friend. Nor is it mere chance-work to-day, when, the hymn or the text given out, the tune sung, or something in the words or manner of the preacher makes tender and holy memories, brings sorrow for sin, and longings for purity and pardon. Far, far back, perhaps in childhood's morning hours, the loving Lord was laying the train for this very event.

*3rd Step.*—"And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter" (Luke xxii., 61).

Doubtless that look was as tender as it was reproachful, yea, was reproachful in its very tenderness.

But note the time of it. It followed at once upon the second cock-crowing. A moment earlier had been too soon, when Peter, stubborn and impenitent, could not have understood it. A moment later had, doubtless, been too late, when Peter would, perhaps, have been out of sight, hurrying down the path of despair either to still more desperate sin or to self-inflicted death.

Note, further, that it followed almost immediately upon the sin. Scarcely a minute before he had stood there at the fire, anathematizing (as the Greek has it), *i. e.*, invoking the dire wrath of God, if he spoke falsely when he

denied his Lord. Suddenly his foul speech is stopped short by the voice of the cock. He comes to himself and his sin, and then, just when the horror of a great darkness had begun to settle down upon him, came that gleam of tender reproof and compassion. The sin was hardly ended when "the Lord turned and looked upon Peter." "Thou, Lord, art good, and ready to forgive."

Again that look came from the suffering One. Out of the awful depths of his own indignities and sorrows his heart went forth to erring Peter.

Behold, here, a love that many waters cannot quench; shame and sorrow cannot; even the black, overwhelming flood of his disciple's shameful sin cannot. It is a love stronger than death—stronger even than sin.

*4th Step.*—"Go your way, tell his disciples and Peter" (Mark xvi., 7).

We have seen how, at the Last Supper, when the shadow of death rested heavily upon him, his heart was at leisure to care for Peter, forewarning and laying up help for him; and how, in the midst of his trial, there were thought, and pity, and timely grace for Peter, snatching him from the very brink of despair. We now come to a new and, in some respects, greater wonder of friendship. The resurrection hour has come, the moment of the holiest and most splendid triumph ever won on earth's lowly stage, when he, the glorious Conqueror of Death and Hell, steps forth from the tomb, having burst its adamant bars. But, as it was not in pain and shame, no, nor even in sin, to stay his love, so now it is not in victory's power to make him forget his lowly, erring friend. Amid it all he remembers

Peter. He knows him to be safe in his penitence; but he knows also that he grieves, being ready to say that he has sinned away his privilege as a disciple. His compassion makes him in haste to comfort Peter, so he leaves behind him with the radiant guardian of the empty tomb a message containing a special reference to Peter, that Peter may know his Lord still remembers him, and counts him among his disciples: "Go your way, tell his disciples, *and Peter*." It is not enough to *save*; he must also *make haste to comfort*. Who is a friend like our Friend?

*5th Step.*—"The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon" (Luke xxiv., 34; see also I. Cor. xv., 5).

Of this interview between Jesus and Peter, we know only that it occurred, and that it was the Lord's second appearance after resurrection. The first was granted to those holy women who "were last at the Cross, and first at the sepulchre." Little wonder! The second interview was not with John the beloved, but with Peter the penitent. Let those who mourn for sin take heed to this. Let them learn Christ's eagerness to heal the broken in heart, till they take courage to press closer, more lovingly and confidingly, to their compassionate Friend and Lord.

Though nothing is told us about that interview, one's imagination loves to dwell upon it. How did they meet? How did Christ look? What did he say? What did Peter feel, and say, and do? We know not. Only of this we are pretty sure, that Peter then entered into the perfect peace of pardon; that, bowing low at those pierced feet, he poured out all his heart in

broken confession of sin; and that, in reply, the Lord made him understand the reality and tender glory of his forgiving love. Henceforth the hallowed gladness of pardon is his. Doubt is gone for ever. He will now be as conscious of the pardon as he is of the sin, and love to Christ, true, lowly, and tender, will dominate his life.

Is there not for every penitent who will seek it, an interview with Christ as personal, as healing, as satisfying, and gracious as this one was? Let all such seek him, diligently and expectant, until he *personally* speaks peace to the soul, and the blissful reality of pardon becomes as vivid and deep as this sense of sin.

*6th Step.*—"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? . . . . Feed my lambs . . . . Feed my sheep" (John xxi., 15-17).

Answering to the threefold denial of Christ came the question, three times repeated, "Lovest thou me?" This induced the threefold confession of love, which was followed by the thrice-given commission to tend the Saviour's flock. All this, observe, in the presence of the other disciples.

In effect, this was the public re-establishment of Peter in his place and authority as apostle. His sin had lowered him in the opinion of his fellows, and they, in after years, might come to question his authority. The Lord takes care that this shall not be. It is not enough that Peter has repented, nor that Christ has comforted him. It is not even enough to satisfy his heart with the deep blessedness of assured pardon. He is jealous for his restored servant's damaged reputation, and so takes measures to establish him for all time in the esteem and honor of his Church.

Who is a friend like our Friend? "Let the children of Zion be joyful in their King." "Praise him according to his excellent greatness."—*The Christian*.



THE CHURCH OF ROME

EVIDENTLY PROVED

Heretick.

BY DR. PETER BERAULT,

*Who abjured all the Errors of the said  
Church in London at the Savoy upon  
the 2d day of April, 1671.*

They are Hereticks who know more than  
the Scripture teacheth.—IRENEUS. Book V.,  
6, 17.

London: Printed by Tho. Hodgkin for the  
Author. MDCLXXX.

MANY, if they write but a Pamphlet, are wont to make a great Preamble; they build, as the Proverb saith, the Door bigger than the House; they promise much, and perform but little. That I may not be guilty of such a fault, and intending to be brief, I shall immediately enter into my Subject and prove thus, that the Church of *Rome* is Heretick.

That Church which is obstinate in her errors, is Heretick; the Roman Church is obstinate in her errors, *Ergo*.

The Major Proposition is true, and granted by all Divines; as for the Minor, which is in question, I prove it thus.

That Church which refuseth to obey the holy Scripture in several points both of faith and practice, is obstinate in her errors; the Roman Church refuseth to obey the holy Scripture in several points both of faith and practice, *Ergo*.

The Major Proposition is also true, and granted by all Divines; as for the Minor which is in question I prove it thus.

That Church which addeth some-

thing to the holy Scripture and diminisheth from it in several points both of faith and practice, and thinketh above that which is written, refuseth to obey the holy Scripture; for we are commanded not to add to the word of God nor to diminish from it; and *Paul* forbids to think above that which is written. But the Roman Church addeth to the holy Scripture, and diminisheth from it, and thinketh above that which is written, in several points both of faith and practice.

*Ergo*. She refuseth to obey the holy Scripture, in several points both of faith and practice; *ergo* She is obstinate in her errors; *ergo* She is Heretick.

That the Roman Church addeth to the holy Scripture, and diminisheth from it in several points both of faith and practice, and thinketh above that which is written, I shall endeavor to prove it evidently.

In the first place it is written in the Law, which God did pronounce and write; thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image, nor any Likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth, thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; and in *Deut.*, take ye good heed unto yourselves, for ye saw no manner of Similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire, lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven Image the similitude of any Figure, the likeness of Male or Female; and in *Isaiah*, it is said, To whom will ye liken God or what likeness will ye compare unto him?

The Roman Church maketh graven Images and boweth down herself to

them, and worshippeth them; she maketh also Images of God the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Then it is manifest she addeth to the holy Scripture, and thinketh above that which is written. And she must not say to excuse herself, that this forbidding is only against Idols, and not against Images, because these words following (nor any Likeness of anything) do contain and signify the one and the other, I mean both Idols and Images.

Likewise she must not say that she worshippeth and serveth them with a service of *δουλεία*, and not with a worship of *λατρεία*, for besides this distinction is new, and unused in the Primitive Church, and not found in the Holy Scripture, it is always true; the Roman Church addeth to the word of God, and thinketh above that which is written. It is certain, according to her own confession, she worshippeth with a worship of *λατρεία* the Images of God the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of the Cross. And these words of Samuel, Prepare your hearts unto the Lord, and serve him only, do destroy all these distinctions of the Roman Church concerning the service of *δουλεία* and worship of *λατρεία*, and that it is a flat Idolatry to worship God in any Image, is expressed and manifested by the Children of Israel, when they made the golden Calf to be a representation of God; for the Text sheweth that it was Idolatry, for which many of them were plagued and punished; and yet their meaning was to worship the true God in the Calf; for they were not so simple as to think or believe that that dead Idol or Image was God, and therefore the Idolatry of

the Church of Rome is as gross and wicked as theirs was.

Pray let us represent to ourselves two souls, one Protestant, and the other Papist, and both before Jesus Christ at the fearful day of his Judgment. If Christ ask the Protestant soul, why she did not make Images, nor bow down herself to them, nor worship them, nor serve them; she will answer him, it is because thou didst say unto me, thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image or any likeness of anything; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them. And if Jesus Christ, as I suppose, should say unto her, thou ought to understand thereby Idols, and distinguish between the worship of *λατρεία* and *δουλεία*, and harken unto the Roman Church; she will reply boldly, Lord thou didst tell me in thy Gospel, in vain do they worship thee, teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men. Thou didst tell me by St. Paul, Though an Angel from Heaven preacheth any other Gospel unto me, than that which I have received, let him be accursed. Thou didst tell me by the same Apostle, not to think of men above that which is written; thou didst tell me in thy Gospel, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. This is the reason why I have not made Images nor worshipped them, nor served them. But what shall a Papist soul answer, when Jesus Christ will speak with her thus. I told thee, thou shalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, etc. I told thee, thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them. Likewise I told thee these words of

Isaiah, To whom will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare unto him? and thou hast not kept my words. What shall this poor Papist answer? I believe nothing but that the Pope and the Roman Church taught him the contrary, and Jesus Christ will undoubtedly reply, seeing thou hast preferred the commandments of the Pope before mine; Go away with the Pope, and see whether he is able to deliver thee from everlasting fire, and perpetual prison.

Secondly, It is written in several places of the holy Scripture, that Jesus Christ is our Saviour and Redeemer, and neither is there any Salvation in any other, for there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved, as it is said in the Acts, it is also declared in the first of John, we have an Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins; and in the first to Timothy, there is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. And notwithstanding all that, the Papists call the Blessed Virgin the She-Redeemer of the world, they say the Saints are in some way our Redeemers, they put their trust and confidence in them, as we may see in several Prayers wherein they speak thus: O great Saint in whom I put my trust and confidence, etc., and they take them for their Advocates and Mediators. It is then evident the Roman Church addeth to the holy Scripture, and thinketh above that which is written; and she must not say she prayeth and beggeth the favour of the Saints, as we pray a friend at Court to request a kindness from his Majesty; for in the first

place it is written, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and it is not written that any other is our Advocate.

Secondly, If the King's Son should say, when ye will ask my father any favour come ye unto me, and not unto another; if afterwards some body should go unto another, he should be very imprudent. Jesus Christ speaketh thus, Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Therefore we must not have another Advocate. Chrisostome, speaking of the woman of Canaan, who though she were a sinner was bold to come unto Christ, saith thus, *En prudentiam hujus mulieris, non precatur Jacobum, non supplicat Joanni, non adit ad Petrum, nec apostolorum cœtum respicit, aut ullum eorum requirit, sed pro his omnibus pœnitentiam sibi comitem adjungit, & ad ipsum fontem progreditur.* Behold the wisdom of this woman, she doth not pray to James, she doth not beseech John, she goeth not to Peter, she looketh not to the company of the Apostles, neither doth request of any of them, but for all this she taketh repentance for her companion; and goeth to the very fountain itself. Ambrose likewise answereth the carnal reason of the Papists, Solent, saith he, *misera uti excusatione, dicentes per istos posse ire ad Deum, sicut per comites itur ad Reges. Ideo ad Regem per tribunos & comites itur, quia homo utique est Rex; ad Deum autem, quem utique nihil latet, suffragatore non est opus, sed mente devota, ubicunque enim talis locutus fuerit, respondet illi: That is, they are wont to use a pitiful excuse, saying, by*

these (Saints) they may have access unto God, as by Earls there is access to Kings. Therefore it is that by Officers and Earls, access is made to the King, because the King himself is a man; but to come to God, from whom nothing is hid, there is no need of a spokesman, but of a devout mind; for wheresoever such one speaketh to him he will answer him. Hereunto I may add that which is written in Ecclesiastes, The dead know not anything neither have any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the Sun. And therefore I may say the Roman Church intreateth in vain the help of the Saints. And the most learned Doctors thereof cannot say how they may hear the prayers of men; for they confess it is not a property of their happiness, and some say they see in the face of God as in a looking-glass, all things here below. Some say they see only the things which belong to them. Some say God discourseth to them the Prayers of men; some say the faithful which are upon the earth, give notice of their desires and minds to the Saints as the Angels do communicate their thoughts one with another. To make it short, the Roman Church is so uncertain concerning the Saints, that oftentimes, as I think, she worshippeth and prayeth to them, that are now burning in everlasting fire.

Thirdly, It is written in the first Chapter to the Hebrews that Jesus Christ purged himself our sins; and in St. John, His blood cleanseth us from all sins; and in St. Paul to the Romans, There is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus. And in the Revelation, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from

hence forth, yea saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours and their works do follow them. And in the book of wisdom Canonized by the general Council of Trent, the souls of the Righteous are in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them. Nevertheless the Roman Church believeth and teacheth that there is a place called Purgatory, wherein the souls of the just are tormented and afflicted, some for a short time, some for a hundred years, some for a thousand and upwards, and others to the end of this world. And though she cannot tell whether this Purgatory is in the air, or in the earth, or in the place wherein sins were committed, yet she saith the Pope with a little Indulgence layed unto a Bead, or Cross, or Medal, or with a Mass, said upon certain days of the week, gives power to deliver from this Purgatory whom he pleaseth, and when he pleaseth. I say then in the first place, since this doctrine is not found in the holy Scripture, the Roman Church addeth to the word of God, and thinketh above that which is written. Secondly, I shew she doth destroy herself, when she will have us to believe under the pain of damnation, that there is a Purgatory. For if there be a Purgatory, either it is to purge sins, or to purge the pain due unto them; it is not for the first, because the Roman Church believeth, Jesus Christ did by himself purge all our sins, and because they are to be purged, afore we be separated from this world. It is then for the purgation of the pain; but the pain is punished and not purged, for a Gallows is not for the purgation of a murder, but for the punishment of it. Therefore seeing

Purgatory, according to the Papists, is only for the pain due to sins, they destroy themselves, when they call it Purgatory. For it hath no warrant in the holy Scriptures; Christ sheweth but two places, Heaven and Hell, saying that the rich man's soul which was unmerciful to Lazarus, went after his death to Hell, and there was tormented, and that Lazarus' soul (he being dead) was carried into Abraham's bosom, a place of joy and comfort. To the Thief which was executed with Christ at his passion and believed in him, Christ answered, This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise. Which sheweth that the souls of the faithful never come into Purgatory fire, to be burnt and punished; for all their sins are forgiven, and consequently the punishment incident to the same is forgiven also, and their souls pass from death to life, namely Heaven. Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth they rest from their labours, and their works follow them. If from the time of their death they have blessedness, and rest, then they are not in any Purgatory fire to be burnt and tormented. And Austin speaketh thus: the first place the faith of the Catholics doth by Divine authority believe, to be the Kingdom of Heaven, the second Hell; a third place we are utterly ignorant of, neither can we find any such in the holy Scriptures. And in another place he saith, that they which believe a Purgatory-fire, are much deceived, and that through a humane conceit.

*(To be continued.)*

THE earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; and the world, and they that dwell therein (Ps. xxiv.). And the cattle upon a thousand hills (Ps. l.).

### A Significant Letter.

The subjoined note from a converted Catholic woman of this city is worthy of the serious consideration of all who are interested in home and foreign missions:

REV. FATHER O'CONNOR:

DEAR SIR:—Last week I attended a meeting of ladies in one of the prominent churches of the city, at which reports were read showing encouraging results from mission work in France. While I was pleased to hear of such success in preaching the Gospel to the Roman Catholic workingmen, shop-girls and servants of that country, I could not help thinking how neglected the same class of persons is in our own country, and especially in this city. I was a servant in a Protestant family for several years, and though all the members of it attended church and had family prayers, none of them ever spoke to me of religion. After I had attended your services and was converted, I visited my former mistress, and she was very glad that I had found the true religion. I told her that if I had been instructed in the right way I would have been converted long before, for whenever I went to confession and communion I sincerely desired to love God. But there was no help for me in those things, and if I had been shown how to pray to Jesus as the only Mediator, I know I would have received the love of God in my soul as I possess it now. Why will not those good Christian ladies who are doing so much for the Roman Catholics in France try to do something for the conversion of the Roman Catholics of New York? Many of them have two and three Roman Catholics in their employment, and the charity of the Gospel, like the charity of the world, should begin at home. My prayers go up continually that you may be sustained in your blessed work as you deserve.

Yours in Christ, MRS. L. C.  
NEW YORK, April 29th.

### THE MORAL THEOLOGY OF THE JESUITS.

Translated from *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* from the Latin Text of Father  
J. P. Gury, of the Society of Jesus, Professor of Moral Theology  
in the Roman College.

---

#### OFFICIAL APPROVAL.

We have read the Compendium of Moral Theology by Father John Peter Gury, S. J. We approve this excellent work for our diocese and sincerely trust it will constantly be in the hands of all our clergy.

L. J. M. CARDINAL DE BONALD,

LYONS, France, Oct. 20th, 1857.

Archbishop of Lyons.

By our authority we hereby confirm the unanimous verdict of learned theologians who have used this work themselves and introduced it into their Seminaries.

AUGUSTUS, Bishop of Puy, France.

September 3d, 1857.

I commend the Compendium of Moral Theology, by Father Gury, for the use and guidance of all priests.

J. B., Bishop of Bourges, France.

January 25th, 1858.

The Moral Theology of Father Gury, already approved by many Bishops, has been examined by our diocesan censor and has been found in harmony with Catholic faith and doctrine, and worthy of all praise.

IGNATIUS, Bishop of Ratisbon.

March 30th, 1874.

The volume from which we translate is the latest edition of this work, and was procured from Fr. Pustet & Co., Catholic Booksellers, Barclay Street, New York, who say in a card addressed to us: "This is the text-book of Moral Theology used in the Provincial Seminary, Troy, N. Y. [which supplies priests to all the State of New York] and in many other Seminaries in the United States.

"FR. PUSTET & CO.

"NEW YORK, February 16th, 1885."

#### PREFACE.

No English version of this remarkable work has hitherto appeared. The moral theological teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, which find their ablest exponent in Gury, are so peculiar in themselves and so different from Scriptural morality that we are confident this translation will prove interesting and useful to Protestants and Catholics.



No theologian and casuist in the Roman Church has so wide a fame as Gury. His work is found in every ecclesiastical college in the world. It is an indispensable handbook for every candidate for the priesthood. Missionary priests are expected to refer to it constantly and are bound to consult it in cases of difficulty or doubt. They are even called together at "conferences" several times every year to prove to the satisfaction of their superiors that its teachings are not forgotten, but are religiously kept in mind for daily inculcation.

Its high authority is consequently admitted on all hands, and in it are found, in a succinct yet lucid form, all the moral theological tenets of the Roman Church. We shall publish a literal translation of this work, not indeed the entire text, but only such portions of it as will be sufficient for the formation of a sound judgment on the system of the Jesuits.

It may be added that a considerable portion of the matter contained in these volumes is utterly unfit for publication in English. Hence we shall be compelled occasionally to use the original text or a French version. We shall omit all that is purely speculative in several treatises which are of minor importance. The exposition of general principles, deductions from them, exceptions often fatal to the rules laid down, naïve admissions, surprising and startling assertions artfully disguised, will be found throughout. We shall not, by any means, confine our translation to what we consider of dangerous or downright immoral tendency, as we are anxious to establish a correct opinion of the general doctrines held and taught by the Jesuits, of whom one of their greatest generals said, "they should forever remain what they are, or cease to exist!"

The "Cases of Conscience" form another valuable book by the same author. They are designed to illustrate the "Compendium," and are divided into corresponding parts. We intend to use them freely, as they will certainly prove entertaining and instructive reading, as well owing to their form and relevancy as to the matters with which they deal. Most of them are sure to be found peculiar and strikingly ingenious, but the candid reader will reject the crafty solutions based on evasions of every kind. Others will prove interesting as exposures of grotesque superstitions, and of that peculiar frame of mind which enables every Jesuit to detect, wherever he goes (as if he actually carried it concealed on his person) an all-pervading odor of *demi-monde* morality.

By rigid adherence to the Latin text we shall escape the usual charges of unfairness so commonly made and dexterously circulated by Roman apologists, especially of the Jesuit type, against their antagonists. No pains shall be spared to render the translation as perfect as possible. We have neither intention nor desire to color the least word or alter the meaning of the most ordinary expression; for above all things we aim at allowing these Jesuits to speak for themselves, and demonstrate through our pages the depth of artful resources, of intricate and impossible metaphysical distinctions of elaborate and bewildering sophistries, by virtue of which they continue to be what they have ever been in the history of the world—the very incarnation of all that is titanic in vice and majestic in iniquity.

## BOOK I.

## CHAPTER I.

## TREATISE ON HUMAN ACTS.

1. Definition.—An act in general is the determination of power, or the exercise of the faculty of acting. Power itself, under circumstances by which it can be reduced to action, is called a first act, and its determination or exercise a second act. A human act is that which proceeds from the deliberate will of man, or from free will directed towards good or evil. Every human act calls into exercise those faculties that elevate man above the brute creation. It is therefore a moral act, and differs from one that is performed in or by man without deliberation, such as spontaneous acts, those produced in sleep, delirium, insanity, drunkenness, or the acts of one deprived of the use of reason by any means whatever.

2. Human acts are of various kinds: spontaneous or compulsory; internal or external; good, bad, indifferent; natural or supernatural; valid or invalid.

## CHAPTER II.

## THE PRINCIPLES OF ACTS.

3. There are three principles: knowledge, will, liberty. These constitute a human act and are necessary for every such act, as is evident from the definition.

## ARTICLE I. Voluntary acts in general.

4. A voluntary act is one that proceeds from the will with intellectual knowledge of the end. The reason of this definition is apparent from what has just been said about the necessity of previous knowledge in order that the will may be inclined to act. It differs, in the first place, from what is simply wished or desired, which is merely the object of the will and in itself neither proceeds from nor depends on it. For instance, a shower during dry weather may be wished or desired by a farmer, but cannot be voluntary. In the second place, it differs from a spontaneous act which is performed with a purely sensual knowledge, as in brutes, or merely material, as in infants.

5. There are different sorts of will: perfect or imperfect; simple or subordinate (which is in a certain sense involuntary). For example; to throw a cargo overboard in order to save a vessel which is in danger of shipwreck, is called simply voluntary. It is voluntarily intended for the safety of the vessel, but is involuntary with regard to the loss of the cargo. Direct or indirect; positive or negative; expressed or tacit; actual, virtual, habitual or interpretative.

6. In the same act, the will can be direct in itself, indirect in its cause, and involuntary. For example: Caius and his friend are walking together, when Titus, who intends to kill Caius, meets them both. He fires at Caius, whom he wounds. At the same time the bullet strikes both the friend who accompanies Caius and a third person named Sempronius, whose presence was

not even suspected. In this case, Caius is wounded by the direct will of Titus; his companion by the indirect, and Sempronius quite involuntarily.

Voluntary acts in particular.—As no special difficulty exists about other divisions, we shall discuss none of them except the indirectly voluntary.

7. The result of this voluntariness is never directly intended, but follows as a result from something else which has been directly intended. Whoever intends a cause, intends also the effect that follows, if he foresaw it.

There are several sorts of cause: physical or moral; immediate or mediate; proximate or remote; actual or accidental.

An actual cause is naturally calculated to produce the effect which follows. Excessive drinking, for instance, is naturally the cause of drunkenness. An accidental cause, although not naturally calculated to produce the effect which follows, may nevertheless do so under certain circumstances. Homicide may accidentally result from drunkenness.

8. An evil effect resulting from indirect voluntariness, that is, from a cause directly intended, must not always be regarded as sinful in the agent. To render him guilty three things are required: First, that he foresaw the effect in a vague or confused manner; because no effect can be voluntary which is not foreseen in some way. Hence a man is not guilty of drunkenness whom a moderate quantity of strong drink has intoxicated if he did not know the alcoholic strength of it. Neither is he guilty if he could or should have foreseen the effect; because from the very fact that he has not foreseen it, the supposition must be denied that he could have done so. The second thing required is that he could have avoided the cause; the third, that he was under no obligation to avoid or remove the cause. The agent exercises a right and merely permits the effect which attends that exercise. Therefore the inordinate motions which doctors and surgeons experience in the exercise of their profession are not to be considered voluntary.

9. It is allowable to perform a good or indifferent act which is immediately followed by a double effect, one good, the other bad; provided the reason for it is proportionately grave; the object, a good one; and that the good effect is not produced by means of the bad one.

10. Hence, during a just war, the general who burns down an enemy's tower in which unoffending strangers have also taken refuge is not guilty of their death.

Neither does a priest sin in giving the Eucharist to a sinner (not publicly known as such) who presents himself in public for that sacrament, although sacrilege is always a heinous crime. A young woman, however, who engages the services of a "doctress" to conceal her shame is guilty of flagrant crime.

#### ARTICLE II. Free will.

11. By an act of free will, or a free act, is meant the issue of a will determined on action, yet having the choice or power of remaining inactive. Liberty is the faculty which gives this power; hence whatever is free is voluntary, but not *vice versa*. Yet although the free and the voluntary are different, they are always found together in every human act.

There are various kinds of liberty: freedom from intrinsic necessity; from external compulsion; freedom of choice between contradictory things; between contrary ones; and between things that differ from each other.

CASES OF CONSCIENCE ON HUMAN ACTS.

CASE I. On the Will.

Arnulf, an honest but passionate man, met an enemy who loaded him with abuse. Burning with a desire to avenge himself he seizes a dagger and rushes at him; but he overcomes his anger and flees; afterwards fearing that he had sinned in attempting any man's life, went without delay to his confessor, threw himself on his knees and related the whole affair.

Another time, knowing that when drunk he usually quarrelled, he kept a close watch on his drinking; but it happened that he was led by his companions to drink more than usual. He became drunk without thinking of his danger, lost all command over himself and quarrelled with his neighbors. But when conscious of what he did, again he hurried to his confessor and anxiously wished to do penance.

*Query.* Did he sin in each case?

Answer. Arnulf does not seem to have sinned in either case, at least grievously, since he had neither a full and perfect knowledge of the evil, nor premeditated it. The very circumstances of the cases show this. Moreover, Arnulf was a hot-headed fellow and may be supposed to have followed his first inclination in the first case; whilst in the second he cannot have sinned if he did not think about the danger of drunkenness.

CASE II. On the Will.

1. Elpidius, a drunken, quarrelsome character, whom drinking renders half mad, quarrels with Titius and desires vengeance, which however he determined to postpone. In a neighboring saloon he then sought to soothe his anger by drinking, but on leaving it in a state of intoxication the same evening, as luck would have it, he encountered Titius, whom he assailed in such a manner that for a long time Titius was obliged to remain idle, thereby suffering a very considerable loss.

2. Blasius wishes to injure his enemy Caius and resolves to shoot his ass. But alas! a double misfortune occurs. The ass escapes safe and sound while he kills the cow of Titius which was lying quietly down behind a thick hedge so that he could not see her when shooting.

*Q. 1.* Should the loss inflicted on Titius be imputed to Elpidius and is he bound to repair it?

*Q. 2.* How would it be in case he were not in the habit of getting drunk but became so inadvertently?

*Q. 3.* Is Blasius bound to restitution for the ass he has missed or the cow he has hit?

*A. 1.* Yes. The reason is that the loss is quite voluntary and foreseen at least confusedly in the cause. Elpidius wished to injure Titius. He drank and ran the risk of getting drunk, seeing that he is naturally fond of drink.

Moreover, he should have foreseen, at least implicitly, that he would inflict an injury during this state of drunkenness inasmuch as he could not ignore the fact of his becoming half mad when drunk and likely to injure some one. Elpidius cannot then be considered free from a mortal sin against justice nor dispensed from the obligation of repairing the wrong he has inflicted.

*A. 2.* In this case the harm done by Elpidius should not be set down to his account, because it was neither voluntary in the act, owing to his loss of reason; nor in its cause, inasmuch as the harm could not be foreseen.

*A. 3.* Blasius is not bound to restitution in either case. Certainly not with regard to the ass which escaped safe and sound. Neither is he bound to make restitution for the cow, since he could not possibly have foreseen such an accident.

Consequently, so far as concerns his conscience, he cannot be obliged to repair the wrong he has inflicted.

But suppose the ass and the cow both belonged to Caius, what then? Well, not even then could he be bound to any restitution according to the strict application of principles, because the harm done would still continue involuntary.

#### CASE IV. On the indirect Will.

Richard, an inn-keeper, is glad to see his house filled with guests, and serves them unsparingly with drink, although he foresees that several of these are sure to get drunk. Yet in order to make money and to prevent blasphemy amongst them, he thinks it no harm to do this. He even goes so far as to welcome men who indulge in impious or scurrilous language because, as he says, he is not bound to worry himself about their conduct.

*Q. 1.* Does he sin mortally by giving drink to people who are certain to get drunk, without any better motive than the love of gain?

*Q. 2.* Does he sin mortally by giving drink to people who are certain to get drunk for the purpose of hindering the sin of blasphemy?

*A. 1.* Yes and no. Yes, in certain cases; as, for instance, when there is question of a man who is almost drunk; because the loss to the saloon-keeper which must in this case prove slight, is sure to prevent the sin of drunkenness. Theoretically and in general—No; because the saloon-keeper is not obliged at serious personal loss to prevent the sins of habitual drunkards. Charity does not bind to such sacrifice. A desire to become richer justifies him in not preventing such sins. They are foreseen in a vague and general sense only, and are accidentally committed contrary to his intention. Besides, if he refuse to serve drinks he must suffer considerable loss. We seldom see a saloon in which drunkenness and quarrelling do not take place; so that if a saloon-keeper were to refuse drinks, his clients would betake themselves elsewhere and get whatever they wanted, leaving him to suffer in vain.

*A. 2.* No, he does not. His anxiety to prevent blasphemy justifies his allowing drunkenness. Saint Jerome says that nothing is more horrible than blasphemy, and of two evils he should avoid the greater.

**FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL McCLOSKEY.**

---

**Second Series.**

---

**LETTER V.**

NEW YORK, April 25th, 1885.

SIR :

For the last two months the Protestant and Roman Catholic papers of this city have been engaged in an animated discussion of the Freedom of Worship bill, which the Jesuitical faction in your Church is pushing through the Legislature of this State with all its unscrupulous energy. Not for many years has there been so warm a discussion between Protestantism and Romanism in this State. The members of your Church who are fighting for this bill say, "We will gain control of the institutions of the State," and the members of the various Protestant Churches say, "You shall not." A history of the movement which has aroused the community to an unwonted pitch is briefly as follows :

The Catholic Union is an organization composed of intelligent men who are under the immediate and direct control of the Jesuits. The Xavier Union is a branch of this, composed of graduates of the Jesuit College on Sixteenth Street, and of St. John's College, Fordham, who meet for social, literary and propagandist purposes, like other clubs and societies. Their dinners and entertainments are attended not only by the leading Roman Catholics of the city—the mayor, judges, legislators, lawyers, and of course your coadjutor, Archbishop Corrigan, the priests and aldermen—but public men of all parties and religions—or of none—are to be found there. At such gatherings, amid the popping of champagne corks, plans are laid for the extension of the power and influence of your Church in all directions.

Having felt the pulse of its influential friends, the Catholic Union set to work in 1872 to have this Freedom of Worship bill passed. At that time it was represented by two lawyers before a committee of the State Commissioners of Public Charities engaged in investigating the management of the House of Refuge. As a result of the evidence on the subject of the religious teaching of the institution the counsel of the Catholic Union offered an additional charge to those already pending. It was alleged that, as to the Catholic children in the institution, the religious teaching and exercises were insufficient, and also that the liberty of conscience of such children was in reality interfered with, because they were not allowed to perform the religious duties which their conscience told them were obligatory on them and necessary to the leading of a proper life. The committee reported that the last charge was not proved. The report was referred to the whole Board of State Commissioners. They, in turn, held that the Legislature was alone competent to deal with the matter and decide it.



The next movement on the part of the Catholic Union was the sending of a memorial to the Board of Managers of the House of Refuge, in February, 1875. This was done by a committee appointed by that body. The memorial was signed by a number of leading Roman Catholics. It set forth general dissatisfaction existing among parents, guardians and Roman Catholics generally because of the obligation of the children to attend religious exercises strictly Protestant on Sundays, and also because of Roman Catholic priests being denied admission to the children. It further set forth arguments drawn from the constitution and from precedents in similar institutions for allowing Roman Catholics like religious privileges with others. The memorial proposed that the House of Refuge should appoint a Roman Catholic chaplain, to be approved by you, Cardinal; that the right should be given to celebrate mass on Sundays; that free access daily should be allowed Catholic priests, and that accommodations should be allowed at stated times for confessions, and also that Sunday-school should be held at appointed hours. The communication was kept for over three months and was then returned with a refusal. The managers of the House of Refuge based their refusal to make the change upon the allegation that it would interfere with the discipline of the institution, all denominations, including Roman Catholics, being represented in the Board of Managers; because they considered the religious teachings and services approved by them sufficient for the souls of the children, and because they did not think Roman Catholic ministrations would be any better for them.

Recourse was next had to the State Legislature. Early in the session of 1881 a bill was introduced in the Senate and Assembly which subsequently was amended in committee. A memorial on the subject, signed by leading Roman Catholics, was also sent to both houses. The bill was opposed by the managers of the House of Refuge. A hearing was had before the Senate committee. The bill, however, was reported favorably and unanimously passed by the Senate. Subsequently it was reported favorably in the Assembly, passed there also, and finally reached Governor Cornell. He vetoed the bill. Governor Cornell in his veto stated that the object of the bill might be correct in theory but that it would be impracticable in its actual operation. He furthermore was of the opinion that the enactment of the bill into a law would interfere with the economical support and proper discipline of the institution. He also said that religious instruction was not the primary purpose of the institution, but that charitable support and correction was. He held that the conflict of authority and teaching which would arise from the enactment of the measure would lead to injurious results to the inmates of the institution.

In 1882 the bill was again introduced, amended in the particulars upon which Governor Cornell had based his veto. It was introduced in the House on March 17th. A full and fair hearing was accorded upon it. On March 22d the bill which had passed the Senate was referred to the House Committee on State Charitable Institutions. It was reported favorably and sent to the Committee of the Whole. It was, however, now so late in the session that the measure was not reached.

In 1883 it was introduced in the Senate. A full hearing was had before the Senate Committee on Miscellaneous Corporations, and it was reported favorably and passed. It was also reported favorably in the Assembly, but did not pass. Again in 1884 it was pushed through both Houses, but they adjourned before final action was taken on it.

During the Presidential election last year it was falsely asserted by the Roman Catholic press that Governor Cleveland had vetoed the bill. The

facts are that, as in the preceding year, it did not come before him at all, yet I have the best of reasons for knowing that if it did, he would veto it as Governor Cornell had done in 1881.

No one knows better than you, Cardinal, on what issue the Presidential election was decided last year. Because the mother, brothers, sisters and other relatives of the Republican candidate were Roman Catholics, your Church, contrary to its past political affiliations, supported him. He thus became the representative of the Roman Catholic Church. This was resented by some of the staunchest Republicans all over the country. We know the result. The candidate of your Church was defeated. "Romanism" killed him; and it will ultimately kill any politician in the United States who leans upon it for support.

When President Cleveland resigned the Governorship of this State, his successor made haste to say in his inaugural message last January that he would sign the Freedom of Worship bill if it came before him. As soon as the Legislature met, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate vied with each other as to which party should present this bill. Two bills were introduced, one by Senator Gibbs, a Republican and Protestant, the other by Senator Murphy, a Democrat and Roman Catholic. This was bidding for the "Roman Catholic vote" with a vengeance. Both bills were almost identical, and were ultimately framed in the form which passed the Senate last month. You will find the text of this bill in the last issue of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*. A jubilant cry went up from all your papers, that now surely "the Church" was going to have its way, not only in the House of Refuge, but in all the institutions of the State managed and paid for by Protestants. "Victory! Victory! the Republican Protestant majority in the Senate of the State of New York have bowed before us, and our triumph in the Nation is only a question of time, for we hold the balance of power, and political leaders will court our favor more and more." A howl of rage went up from the Protestant press in reply. It might be in better taste for me to say, Cardinal, that, "an indignant protest went up," but that phrase would be a feeble expression of the sentiments of the religious papers of all the Protestant denominations. Notwithstanding the fact that two of the ablest Methodist ministers in this city, the Rev. Merritt Hulburt and Rev. James M. King, had been sent up to Albany by the Evangelical Alliance to speak against the bill, and that Counsellor Robinson had been commissioned by the House of Refuge to speak against it, and that Mr. Cram, one of the directors of the House of Refuge, had made a most eloquent and patriotic plea against it, and that sermons had been preached in several Protestant Churches against it, still it was passed by the Senate. The Protestant press stormed and threatened in long editorials. The *New York Observer* had a black border around the names of the Senators who voted for the measure. The other religious papers were equally vigorous according to their degree. Some of the "cultured" sort professed their great respect for the Roman Catholic Church, but protested that this measure was not desired by the better class of Roman Catholics. As I know you do not read any opposition papers, Cardinal, I take this opportunity of bringing before you the

following extracts from various journals. As you see, they are all soundly American without reference to any particular form of religion.

In his first message to the Legislature, Governor Hill, who succeeded Governor Cleveland in the executive chair of this State, discussed the subject of Freedom of Religious Worship. The principles which he asserts are in the main sound and sensible, such as Protestants contend for, but are never allowed to enjoy where the Jesuits have the power to enforce their own will. But it is very evident that the Governor's argument is directed to the encouragement of a measure which the Jesuits are pressing under the deceptive title of a bill to "Secure Freedom of Worship." The design of that bill is to give the Romish priests possession of the House of Refuge, with the power to overturn its non-sectarian character, to introduce the teachings of a particular sect, with its forms and ceremonies, and thus to violate the rights of American citizens, who are associated in a good work in their own way without in the slightest degree infringing on the rights of any man, woman or child. The title of the bill, which has been again and again before the Legislature, is a fraud, because it intimates that freedom of worship is not now allowed and enjoyed in the House of Refuge; and secondly, it presents the promoters of the bill as friends of religious liberty, whereas they are its implacable foes.

The remarks made at the dinner of the Xavier Union by Governor Abbett, of New Jersey, and ex-Postmaster James, of this city, on the subject of "Freedom of Worship," have attracted very general attention during the week and a desire on the part of prominent persons holding fixed opinions on one or the other side of the question that there should be some public discussion of its merits, in view of the bill at present pending before the Legislature. On the occasion referred to Governor Abbett said, as reported in the *Telegram* :

"I care nothing about a man's religion. I introduced a bill which corresponds to your Freedom of Worship bill at a time when political death was threatened to every man who undertook to advocate it. What is the result? One of the men who advocated it is now United States Senator, although of an opposite political faith. Another came very close to being elected Governor, and a third is the present Governor. (At this point the entire company arose and proposed three times three for Governor Abbett.) Gentlemen," said the Governor, "if I mean anything in the world I mean this—that you can imprison a man's body but you cannot imprison his soul; that belongs to the immortal God who created it." The scene at this point was almost uproarious, but the Governor, with a wave of his hand, said, "You did not allow me to finish, and I will conclude with this remark. Independent of any legislation there is to-day in New Jersey freedom for every inmate in jails, reformatories, asylums and other public institutions—the fullest guarantee for the exercise of the religious freedom of the inmates according to their respective forms of worship. (Applause.) From information I have received New York has not yet risen to this level of toleration, but even if your sister State is comparatively insignificant, let me hope that the Xavier Union, as the embodiment of equal justice to all men, civil and religious alike, will succeed in the noble mission it has undertaken."

Ex-Postmaster James, in reply to Governor Abbett, spoke as follows:

"Let me say to the Governor of New Jersey, in reply to his remark, that the people have enlisted in this cause for the war. (Tremendous applause.) Governor Abbett knows what is conveyed by that declaration. I shall be ashamed of my own State till the day will come when equal justice and the fullest freedom of conscience shall be afforded to all men."

A reporter, desiring to facilitate an approximation to general public opin-

ion on a subject of so much importance, has caused several noted clergymen to be interviewed regarding their views upon it, and these will be found below:

When the attention of the Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby was called to the report of the Xavier Union meeting, the Doctor said: "I suppose you want my views upon the Freedom of Worship bill. I know all about it. I had not seen this report. I am a little surprised at Governor Abbett; but I am more surprised at the utterances of Mr. James, whom I know, and who is generally a sensible fellow. But Mgr. Capel has been about, and I suppose he has turned all their heads.

"Freedom of worship!" he went on. "The whole thing is absurd. What freedom has a criminal, and why should he have any? And why can he have any and still be a criminal? Has he freedom of dress, freedom of eating, freedom of walking, freedom of speech, freedom of action or freedom of rights of any kind? No! He could not and be a prisoner under criminal treatment. Why, then, should he have freedom of religion?"

"Is it your opinion, Doctor, that our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, in the matter referred to, are laboring under any injustice—any inequality—of which they have just reason to complain?"

"I know of none," promptly answered Dr. Crosby. "There is no privilege which is accorded to the Presbyterians, to the Episcopalians, to the Baptists, to the Methodists, to any Protestant body, which is not accorded to them. They can visit their own people at will in all our public institutions; they can talk to them publicly or privately; they can give the sacrament; they can baptize; they can administer extreme unction. They can, if they have a desire to do so, address the entire assembled inmates. I know of no grievance. What they want is to be allowed full liberty of ceremonial observance, with a meeting place consecrated to their own special use. This is what they want; and this, I say it emphatically—this they cannot have.

"Why, sir," he continued, "think of it! If we grant the Roman Catholics what they want in the matter of ceremonial conveniences, then we must begin anew to harmonize our ideas of liberty with privilege. We shall be compelled in all fairness to consider the claims of the Baptists and provide them with baptistries; the claims of the Salvationists and provide them with drums and horns and tambourines and procession accommodations, and even the claims of the Chinese and provide them with some sort of Joss houses. There will be no end to it."

At this stage the reporter called Dr. Crosby's attention to ex-Postmaster James' remarks—"We are enlisted in this matter for the war."

Dr. Crosby, who spoke throughout the interview with great calmness and deliberation, but with emphasis, said: "On this point I have no desire to make any concealment of my opinions. I have no desire to mince matters; I have clear and well defined views on the subject, and I am quite willing to have them recorded. I am unwilling to believe that our Roman Catholic friends are disposed to push matters to extremities. I don't believe that any such purpose exists, and I cannot bring myself to think that they will ever be guilty of such folly. But this I will say, and I wish you to be careful in taking down my words—if they do consolidate and make a deliberate and organized effort in the direction indicated they will touch us on a point on which we are most sensitive, and as the result the American blood will warm, and we will arise in our might and grind them to powder."

Accompanying the reporter to the door in the most kindly way, the Doctor added: "Be careful of my provisos. We don't force this issue; but depend upon it, if the issue is forced by our Roman Catholic friends, it will be found that the American man is somebody."

The reporter then called upon the Rev. Dr. John Hall, who may be regarded, like Dr. Crosby, as a fair representative of American Presbyterianism in the purely ecclesiastical sphere. Dr Hall's attention having been called to the Xavier Union meeting and to the speeches made on the occasion, he expressed himself in a somewhat regretful manner.

"I am sorry," he said, "that our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens seem disposed to push matters. I see no cause for it. It really does seem as if they were under the influence of the spirit of aggression, and as if they were resolved to make trouble. I regret it sincerely."

"Is it your opinion, Dr. Hall, that the Roman Catholics of the State of New York are laboring under any grievances?"

"I really know of none. In my opinion they have all the privileges enjoyed by Protestants of any or all of the denominations, and have some special privileges besides. No other body of Christians asks special favors from the Legislature. They not only ask them—they obtain them. But they are not satisfied."

"What do you think will be the effect of this movement in regard to freedom of worship?"

"Well, it is hard to say. It is really hard to predict what a New York Legislature may do in these times. But this I will say: If the demands of the Roman Catholics in regard to freedom of worship, as they are pleased to call it, are complied with, a grievous wrong will be done to our public institutions. They are no doubt State institutions, but they owe much to good men, some of whom are still living, but some of whom are no more—few if any of whom believed that they were contributing to the Roman Catholic forces in the country. If the Freedom of Worship bill should become law, the immediate effect will be to dry up one of our noblest channels of Christian charity. I quite agree with what Dr. Fulton, of Brooklyn, said last Sunday—that considering the character of the inmates, the passing of this bill would virtually put our hospitals, asylums, and other such institutions under Catholic control."

"Should an issue be forced, Dr. Hall, what then?"

"Oh, I can't think of that. It has not come to that yet. It never will, I hope. But, if it should be forced, as things now are, the result is not doubtful. The Catholics must suffer. The American people, in my judgment, have a very clear and positive idea of religious liberty."

This bill, whatever may be claimed by its advocates, has been promoted entirely by citizens of the Roman Catholic faith. They alone have demanded its passage; they alone desire it, and their interests and wishes alone are regarded by those who are endeavoring to make it a law. It is entirely inconsistent with the principles on which our institutions are based, and many sincere Catholics are opposed to it. If it is passed by the Legislature it will be because a majority of its members are anxious to secure the favor of the mass of Catholic voters and of those who exercise a strong influence over them. For the first time do we find both parties in the Legislature competing for this vote.

In the debate in the Senate last March Senator Michael Murphy made a strange confession, and brought a serious charge against a gentleman of high standing in this city. Senator Murphy said:

"When Senator Esty [who opposed the bill] quotes Chas. P. Daly or Nathaniel Jarvis, Jr. [members of the Board of Managers of the House of Refuge], as Catholics, I state that Charles P. Daly, Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas of New York, and President of the Historical Society of this country, is about the same kind of a Catholic as I am myself. He is a nominal Catholic and not a representative Catholic, and not at present an officer of the institution to which



the gentleman refers. Mr. Nathaniel Jarvis, Jr., never was a Catholic. He pretended to be a Catholic and received a sprinkling of holy water on his head because James T. Brady's sister refused to marry him unless he became one of her faith. He falsified the religion of his mother simply because he wanted to marry a woman he loved, who refused to marry him because of the suck she drew from her mother's breast. That is the kind of a woman that compelled him to go on his knees and receive the sacred waters of Christ before she would go to the altar with him. After doing this he recanted and has never been inside of a Catholic Church since. That is the kind of a man who is proclaimed here as one of the disciples of the Catholic faith. That is all I have to say about that question at present, but on the further discussion of it I will show you where a Catholic prelate went from the shores of New York with Thurlow Weed, to do what? To save your country when men around this circle were in arms. That Catholic prelate left the port of New York with Thurlow Weed, and went on his knees before a Catholic monarch, asking him to keep his hands off the struggle that was going on here, and let the people determine it. I will show you, furthermore, that that same Catholic prelate went into Camp Scott; and what did he do there? He put on the robes of his priesthood, put on his mitre that represented his office, and do you know what he did? He confirmed and confessed the men who had arms in their hands going to the war to preserve the country that protects you and the country that permitted you to make the money that you have."

I presume Mr. Jarvis is able to defend himself from such a gross charge of insincerity, though it is a question whether he ought to take any notice of the vaporings of a man capable of making such an infamous statement in the Senate of the State. But as to the laudation of the late Archbishop Hughes, I think the less said about the part taken by your Church in the Civil War the better for Mr. Murphy's cause. Does he forget the draft riots by Irish Roman Catholics in this city in 1863 and their attendant horrors? Does he forget the letter of Pope Pius IX. to Jeff. Davis at a time when the Pope was a temporal ruler? "This," says Lossing, "was the only official recognition the Confederacy received from any government."

The Pope's blessing to Jeff. Davis and the Southern people did not do them much good. A glance at history would have told them that his "blessing" had never benefited nations or individuals. The Lord God of Hosts does not sanction the acts of a man, whether blessing or cursing, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." (II. Thess. ii., 4.)

Lest Senator Murphy should forget this letter I give it place here for his and your enlightenment.

Letter of Pius IX. to Jefferson Davis:

"ILLUSTRIOUS AND HONORABLE PRESIDENT.—We have just received with all suitable welcome the persons sent by you to place in our hands your letter dated 23d of September last. Not slight was the pleasure we experienced when we learned from these persons and the letter with what feelings of joy and gratitude you were animated, illustrious and honorable President, as soon as you were informed of our letters to our venerable brothers John Archbishop of New York, and John Archbishop of New Orleans, dated the 18th of October



of last year, and in which we have with all our strength excited and exhorted those venerable brothers that in their episcopal piety and solicitude they should endeavor with the most ardent zeal, and in our name to bring about the end of the fatal civil war which has broken out in those countries, in order that the American people may obtain peace and concord and dwell charitably together. It is particularly agreeable to us to see that you, illustrious and honorable President, and your people are animated with the same desires of peace and tranquillity which we have in our letters inculcated upon our venerable brothers. May it please God at the same time to make the other peoples of America and their rulers, reflecting seriously how terrible is civil war, and what calamities it engenders, listen to the inspirations of a calmer spirit and adopt resolutely the part of peace. As for us we shall not cease to offer up the most fervent prayers to God Almighty that he may pour out upon all the people of America the Spirit of Peace and Charity, and that he will stop the great evils which afflict them. We at the same time beseech the God of mercy and pity to shed abroad upon you the light of his grace and attach you to us by a perfect friendship.

"Given at Rome at St. Peter's, the 3rd day of December, 1863, of our Pontificate 18. PIVS IX."

(Appleton's Annual Cyclopædia, 1863. Vol. iii., p. 820.)

Thank God, the North and South are again united, never to be separated, citizens of our great Republic where religious and civil freedom is assured to all, and where the Word of God has free course. But no thanks are due to your Church for this, as the above letter recognizing the Confederacy, and your unceasing attempts on our religious freedom show.

Since the foregoing was put in type, a test vote on this bill was taken in the Assembly (April 29th), and the House was equally divided, fifty-eight for it and fifty-eight against it. That kills the bill for this year.

I have delayed this number of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* several days until its fate should be determined. To the efforts of the Evangelical Alliance is chiefly due the defeat of this Jesuitical attempt to gain control of the institutions of the State. But will your Church accept defeat gracefully and bow before the will of the American people in this matter? Not a bit of it. Your special organ, *The Catholic Review*, says in its issue of this week: "This bill will pass sooner or later. The longer the struggle the more certain and the more glorious the victory. The greater the assaults on us, the greater the inquiry into our faith and the reasons therefor." There were no "assaults," but a vigorous defence against your aggressions. It is well, however, that the warning that the "struggle" will be renewed by the Jesuits should be heeded. For my part I shall go on "struggling" to rescue the souls of the people from your soul-destroying superstitions as more congenial work than fighting political battles which seems to be the chief purpose of your whole Church system.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

## ROME: PAGAN AND PAPAL.

*(Continued from Page 160.)*

## CHAPTER X.

## THE SUPERSTITION AND IMMORALITY OF MEDIÆVALISM.

Since there are so many who desire to restore the priestly and monkish dominion of the Middle Ages, it is most important that we should understand what it was. We will, therefore, endeavor to get a few more glimpses of the religion and morality of that period. The following remarks of Hallam are instructive:

"In that singular Polytheism, which had been grafted on Christianity, nothing was so conspicuous as the belief of perpetual miracles. . . . Successive ages of ignorance swelled the delusion to such an enormous pitch, that it was as difficult to trace, we may say without exaggeration, the real religion of the Gospel in the popular belief of the laity, as the real history of Charlemagne in the romance of 'Turpin.' It must not be supposed that these absurdities were produced, as well as nourished, by ignorance. In most cases they were the work of deliberate imposture. Every cathedral or monastery had its tutelary saint; and every saint his legend, fabricated in order to enrich the churches under his protection by exaggerating his virtues, his miracles, and consequently his power of serving those who paid liberally for his patronage.

"That the exclusive worship of saints, under the guidance of an artful, though illiterate, priesthood, degraded the understanding, and begot a stupid credulity and fanaticism, is sufficiently evident. But it was also so managed as to loosen the bonds of religion and pervert the standard of morality. . . . They—the saints—appeared only as perpetual intercessors, so good-natured and so powerful, that a sinner was more emphatically foolish than he is usually represented, if he failed to secure himself against any bad consequences. For a little attention to the saints, and especially to the Virgin, with due liberality to their servants, had saved, he would be told, so many of the most atrocious delinquents, that he might equitably presume upon similar luck in his own case.

"This monstrous superstition grew to its height in the twelfth century."—*Middle Ages* (1860), vol. iii., pp. 298-300.

In a note Hallam gives some examples of the stories used by the monks, from which we extract the following:

"At the Monastery of St. Peter, near Cologne, lived a monk perfectly dissolute and irreligious, but very devout towards the apostle. Unluckily he died suddenly without confession. The fiends came as usual to seize his soul. St. Peter, vexed at losing so faithful a votary, besought God to admit the monk

into Paradise. His prayer was refused; and though the whole body of saints, apostles, angels and martyrs joined at his request to make interest, it was of no avail. In this extremity he had recourse to the mother of God. 'Fair lady,' he said, 'my monk is lost if you do not interfere for him.' . . . The Queen-mother assented, and followed by all the virgins, moved towards her Son."

"The rest," says our author, "may be easily conjectured." And he adds, "Compare the gross stupidity, or rather the atrocious impiety of this tale, with the pure theism of the *Arabian Nights*, and judge whether the Deity was better worshipped at Cologne or at Bagdad."

We will quote one other story from the same source, in which "the Virgin takes the shape of a nun, who had eloped from the convent, and performs her duties ten years, till, tired of a libertine life, she returns unsuspected. This was in consideration of her never having omitted to say a 'Hail Mary' as she passed the Virgin's image."

These and other examples are taken, Hallam tells us, from a collection of "religious tales, by which the monks endeavored to withdraw the people from romances of chivalry." Certainly this was casting out Satan by means of Satan.

Of a similar tendency is the story of St. Kentigern, who figures in the armorial bearings of the city of Glasgow. It is furnished to me by my friend Mr. MacGeorge and is taken from his *Armorial Insignia of the City of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1866).

"The fish with the ring in his mouth in the ancient seals of the Bishopric of Glasgow, refers to the story of St. Kentigern and the lost ring of the Queen of King Cadzan. It is given in the office for the day of the saint in the Breviary of Aberdeen.

"The queen, enamored of a certain knight, gave him a ring which the king had before presented to her. The king, aware of her unfaithfulness, got it from the knight, and, after throwing it into the Clyde, demanded it from the queen, threatening her with death if it were not produced. Having sent her maid to the knight, and failed to recover the ring, the queen despatched a messenger to Kentigern, telling him everything, and promising the most condign penance. The saint, taking compassion on her, sent a monk to the river to angle, directing him to bring alive the first fish he might take. This being done, the saint took from the mouth of the fish, which was a salmon, the ring, and sent it to the queen, who restored it to the king, and thus saved her life."

The crest of the city of Glasgow, adopted from this vile story, is the saint vested as a bishop. On the shield is a salmon on its back, holding up to the saint a ring in its mouth; the supporters are two salmon, each with a ring in its mouth. The whole fable is represented in the seal of Bishop Wyschard—made about A.D. 1271. The legend to the seal, on which are figured the saint, the king, and the queen—but not the knight—briefly tells the story: "*Rex furit: Hæc plorat: patet aurum: Dum sanctus orat.*" That is, in English, "The king rages: she laments: the ring turns up: while the saint is praying."

The hymn appointed for the *more solemn altar service* of the saint's day thus sums up the story:

" Mœcha mærens confortatur,  
Regi reconciliatur,  
Dum in fluctu qui jactatur  
Piscis proferet annulum."

Which, perhaps, may be freely rendered:

" Saint, queen, and knight an evil union make  
With monk, who, with a hook, the fish doth take.  
The adulterous queen is by the saint consoled,  
Who kindly cloaks her guilt, and brings the tell-tale gold."

The moral tone of this Scotch saintly story is not, it must be confessed, higher than that of the two which have preceded it. And even in the present day the Church of Rome seems to have the same low estimate of her gods.

Some years ago, Ali Pasha, at that time governor of Egypt, presented the Pope with some pillars of oriental alabaster for the magnificent Basilica of St. Paul, which was then in process of reconstruction. They were designed by the architect to support the Baldachino, or canopy of the high altar, in which position the reader may now find them. In the winter of 1852 I was in Rome, and went to see them. They were lying on the ground at the time, ready for erection, and splendid monoliths they were. As I stood, with a group of friends, looking at and admiring them, the old *Custode*, who was exhibiting them remarked, "I am sure the Virgin will never allow those columns to be erected to the honor of St. Paul." "But why?" we asked. "Oh, she will be jealous," was the reply; "she will want them for herself."

Thus calmly did the votary attribute the vile passion of envy to his goddess. One is carried back to Homer and the courts of Olympus, to the gods the greater and the gods the less, to their squabbles, envies, intrigues, and uncleanness; and one is moved to ask—What difference is there between gods heathen and gods ecclesiastical; between the Pantheon of Olympus and the Pantheon of the Church?

The courteous intimacy implied in the chivalrous phrase attributed in our first story to St. Peter, when he addresses the Virgin as "Fair lady," reminds me of an Irish fact illustrative of the great familiarity existing between the gods and their ministers.

I can vouch for its authenticity, having received it from two independent quarters; and one of my informants, an Irish archdeacon who knew the persons concerned, has furnished me with their names.

A Roman Catholic priest, Father James O'M., while taking a friendly glass with some of his brethren, was summoned to attend a parishioner—a woman in child-bed at the point of death. The priest dismissed the messenger with a promise of speedy attendance, but at the entreaty of his friends, jolly fellow that he was, he stayed to take another and another glass of punch. More than once was the messenger sent away with the same assurance. Again he appeared, not, however, for the same reason as before, but to inform the priest

that his presence was not now needed, since the poor woman had just passed away, without having received the last Sacrament of the Church—Extreme Unction, the priest's passport to Paradise. At first the priest was so agitated by the anger of his parishioner, and so ashamed of his own neglect, that he forgot the power he possessed over the invisible world. But, on recovering his presence of mind, he told the man that there was no cause for alarm in regard to the departed, since he could make it all right. Then, calling for a piece of paper, he wrote a few lines, and rolling up the paper tightly, desired the man to place it in the mouth of the corpse. At the same time he charged him on no account to allow the paper to be opened, or the charm would vanish and the soul be ruined.

The man went off satisfied, and so far all was well. But unfortunately the curiosity of the doctor who had charge of the case was excited, and he felt a great desire to see what Father James had written on the scrap of paper. Accordingly he persuaded the nurse, and at a convenient moment she secretly withdrew the paper, and brought it to him.

"The words written on the paper," says the archdeacon in his letter to me, "were these: 'Dear Saint Peter, please admit the bearer—she is a parishioner of mine.'"

The Irish priest had only followed the example of no less a man than St. Gregory, called "the Great," of whom Mrs. Jameson, in her *Sacred and Legendary Art* (vol i., p. 323), relates the subjoined story:

A monk under the excommunication of Gregory had died unabsolved, and when the saint heard of it he was filled with horror, but at the same time was by no means without resource.

"He wrote upon a parchment a prayer and a form of absolution, and gave it to one of his deacons, desiring him to go to the grave of the deceased and read it there."

The charm—which seems to have been valid only if used in a particular place, that is, at the grave—was successful; for "on the following night, the monk appeared in a vision, and revealed to the saint his release from torment."

The following modern instances from the East, for the correctness of which I am able to vouch, are not inapt illustrations of this kind of superstition:

A priest of the Greek Church was importuned to go to a sick person, and being at play was unwilling to do so. "There," said he, taking off his cap and giving it to the messenger, "place that on the head of the sick man, and it will answer all the purpose." The messenger went away well-contented!

An indolent bishop of the same Church, too lazy to go to a distant ordination at which a part of his duty was to breathe on the candidates, adopted this expedient: Having procured a couple of bladders and filled them with his breath, he despatched them to the ordination, directing that puffs from them should be blown upon the heads of the candidates.

Such are a few specimens of mediævalism as it was, as it is still in many parts, and as some would have it to be again in Protestant England—"which peril, Heaven forbid!"